

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 20-22 and 24-27 are pending. Claim 20 has been amended to include certain features recited in cancelled claim 23. Claim 27 has been allowed.

Rejection of claim 20 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Stefik et al. (US Pat. No. 5629980)

Applicants submit that for the reasons discussed below, amended claim 20 is not anticipated by Stefik et al.

The present invention relates to setting up and subsequently processing a program containing copyright information that may affect how the video processing system operating on the program, particularly in the event that the copyright information has changed between initial set up of the system and receipt of the program. The solution according to the invention provides for initial set up of the video processing system to accommodate a program to be received at a future time by receiving initial copyright information that is associated with the program and enabling the system to process the program in a first operating mode in response to the initial copyright information. The invention further provides for receiving updated copyright information and adjusting the operating mode of the system as necessary in response to the updated copyright information.

In this regard, claim 20 has been amended to recite:

- b. storing said initial copyright information and **enabling said video processing system to process the selected program in a first operating mode in response to said initial copyright information;**
- c. receiving updated copyright information associated with said selected program from a second source; and
- d. updating said stored copyright information in response to said updated copyright information and **enabling said video signal processing system to process the selected program in one of said first and a second operating mode in response to said updated copyright information.** (emphasis added)

Applicants submit that nowhere does Stefik et al. disclose or suggest the above-noted limitations of amended claim 20.

Stefik discloses a system for controlling use and distribution of digital works using repositories that store and control the transfer of the digital works. The digital works have corresponding usage rights that are granted by the owner of the work, are permanently attached to the work, and define how the work may be used and/or further distributed. In that regard, Stefik teaches the use of rights element called "copy-count" that defines the number of copies of a work subject to the right (col. 21, lines 15-24; col. 31, lines 47-62; col. 34, lines 58-60; and col. 35, lines 19-21). When an authorized requestor requests a certain number of copies of a given digital work, the server transmits the digital work with the copy-count field set to the number of copies requested.

However, nowhere does Stefik disclose or suggest enabling the system to process a program in a first operating mode in response to an initial copyright information, and enabling the system to process the selected program in one of the first and a second operating mode in response to updated copyright information. As Stefik fails to disclose notable features of claim 20, applicants submit that amended claim 20 is not anticipated by the teachings of Stefik et al.

Rejection of claims 21 and 26 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stefik et al.

Claim 26 has been amended to including limitations similar to those added to claim 21. Applicants submit that the Official Notice fails to cure the defect of Stefik as applied to amended claims 20 and 26. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 21, which depends from amended claim 20, and amended claim 26, are patentably distinguishable over the teaching of Stefik et al. for at least the reasons discussed above.


Rejection of claims 21 and 26 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stefik et al.

Claim 26 has been amended to including limitations similar to those added to claim 21. Applicants submit that the Official Notice fails to cure the defect of Stefik as applied to amended claims 20 and 26. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 21 and 22, which depend from amended claim 20, and amended claim 26,

are patentably distinguishable over the teaching of Stefik et al. for at least the reasons discussed above.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,
T. Horlander, et al.

By: 
Paul P. Kiel
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 40,677


THOMSON Licensing Inc.
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 6/2/05

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on:

6-2-05
Date


Lori Klewin